

- **Triton variegatum*. *Triton corrugatum* : dead.
 **Chenopus pes-pellicani* : common.
 **Purpura lapillus* : St. Simon's Island, full-sized white ; Vigo small, dark colour.
 **Nassa reticulata* : abundant : dark-coloured undulated variety at St. Simon's Island : mud.
 * — *macula* : sand. **Nassa varicosa* : mud.
 — : smooth, purple inside : banded : animal very active : extremely abundant in mud.
 **Buccinum minimum* : nullipore.
 **Ringicula auriculata* : very abundant in mud.
 **Erato levis* : two live specimens : sand.
 **Cypræa europæa*.
 **Sepia*.
 **Octopus*.
Echinus : four species, one of which is new to me.
 Starfishes, four, identical with British.
Holothuriæ, } same as obtained in Bantry Bay.
Cucumariæ, }

ZOOPHYTES.

- Alcyonium digitatum*.
Pennatula (Mediterranean species).
Actiniæ : several.
 Various animals of genera unknown to me.

R. MACANDREW.

LI.—On the Identification of a new Genus of Parasitic Insects, Anthophorabia. By GEORGE NEWPORT, Esq., F.R.S. & L.S.

To the Editors of the Annals of Natural History.

GENTLEMEN,

London, May 21, 1849.

THE care which is always taken in the 'Annals and Magazine of Natural History' to preserve to zoological nomenclature in this country a character for precision and honesty, induces me to request your insertion in that Journal of the following description of a Chalcididous insect which I discovered in the years 1831 and 1832 in the nests of *Anthophora retusa* at Richborough in Kent, and communicated on the 20th of March last to a meeting of the Linnæan Society ; and also of some statement of facts connected with this communication.

Family CHALCIDIDÆ.

Genus *Anthophorabia*, Newp.

(Female.) Head broader than the thorax ; antennæ six-jointed, pilose, with the second, third, fourth and fifth joints nearly equal, the sixth long, oval ; thorax and abdomen of equal length ; wings with a median bifid nervure ; tarsi five-jointed.

(*Male.*) Antennæ four-jointed, basal joint arched, greatly dilated and excavated on the under surface, second joint cylindrical, third large, globose, fourth elongated, oval* ; eyes stemmatous ; wings abbreviated. Length 1 line.

SPECIES.—*A. retusa*, Newp. *Female* bronze green, legs yellowish. *Male* yellow or deep ferruginous, stemmata blackish ; *larva* sub-cylindrical, formed of fourteen segments, and slightly attenuated at each extremity.

Found in the cells of *Anthophora* at Richborough, Kent.

Although I had found this insect in all its stages of development, had made carefully finished drawings of it, and of its details in 1831 and 1832, and had showed these at that time to many friends, of which I have ample proof, I delayed to publish any account of it until recently, because I had intended to have done this in connexion with some facts of anatomy not yet put forth. Being engaged, however, in investigating the relation which subsists between the special anatomy of animals and the peculiarities in their œconomy and instincts, the male of this insect appeared to me to offer a good exemplification of my views in the peculiarities of its organs of vision, as compared with what I had seen and known of its habits. But as I could not find any description of the insect in any entomological work to which I had access, it became necessary for me to characterize and name it, that others might be able to identify it, before any references to it could be of value to science. I did this in the first part of a paper read to the Linnæan Society on the 20th of March last, and the description above given was printed in the report of the meeting of that Society inserted in the 'Gardeners' Chronicle' for the 24th of March, No. 12, page 183. The description and naming of the insect were thus but incidental to the chief object of my paper ; and my claim to a scientific notification of the genus and species can only take date from that period, although I have known of the existence of this insect for nearly eighteen years. The particulars given in my paper of the place and time of its discovery were but as matters of history in connexion with its habits. Imagine then my surprise at the close of the reading of that portion of the paper at hearing the good faith of my statements abruptly questioned in some remarks addressed to the Society by Mr. John Obadiah Westwood, who made it appear that my knowledge of the insect *Anthophorabia* must have been derived from *vivâ voce* statements made by himself at a meeting of the Entomological Society in July 1847, when he referred to an undescribed insect by the name of *Melittobia Audouinii*, and

* It is probable that the large terminal joint of the antennæ, both in the male and female, may be formed by the union of two or more joints in one mass.

where, he asserted, I had seen his drawings of it, which I instantly denied. *Six weeks* after this aspersion, and *after* I had adduced—at the reading of the second part of my paper to the Linnæan Society on the 1st of May instant—living evidence of the truth of my previous announcement, Mr. Westwood disclaimed having doubted my discovery of *Anthophorabia* in 1832, and also disclaimed having cast any imputation on my statements. But *six days* later, May 7th, he appears to have addressed himself a second time *vivâ voce* to a meeting of the Entomological Society, at which I was not present, and at which he well knew, as I have ceased to be a Member, that I was not likely to be present to reply to his assertions. In the carefully drawn up report of that meeting, printed in the ‘Gardeners’ Chronicle’ on the 12th of May, No. 19, page 295, he again repudiates, yet at the same instant reconveys the imputation, and there, for the first time, prints his description of *Melittobia*, and claims to have described this insect sufficiently in 1847. Now the facts are these:—In the second volume of Mr. Westwood’s ‘Introduction,’ page 160, and printed in November 1839, the author refers to an insect found in France by M. Audouin in the nests of *Odynerus*, *Anthophora* and *Osmia*, and says, “*the male has most singular antennæ, and minute rudiments of wings,*” and then remarks, “*the species has not yet been described.*” Nearly eight years elapsed and no description of the insect had been published by M. Audouin, nor had any reference again been made to it by Mr. Westwood until July 1847, when, according to the printed Proceedings of the Entomological Society, vol. v. part 3. p. xviii, he “*exhibited specimens and drawings*” of Audouin’s insect, and mentioned that “*the antennæ of the males are singularly distorted (!) and the wings almost rudimental; thus offering a strikingly opposite analogy (!?) to other bee-parasites, such as Stylops, Meloë and Sitaris,*” and for this insect he proposed the name of “*Melittobia Audouinii.*” This is the whole that he had published respecting it, and those are his own words, Mr. Westwood being at that time Secretary of the Entomological Society, and enabled to prepare and to publish in the ‘Proceedings’ what he pleased. But every naturalist will perceive that neither of these extracts constitutes a description of the insect named; these vague allusions being equally applicable to other genera of Chalcididous insects. No entomologist advanced beyond his schoolboy days will contend that “*most singular antennæ*” or “*singularly distorted antennæ*” are descriptive terms or phrases. They apply equally well to at least four other genera of this family of insects, and of which three have been characterized by Mr. Westwood himself, viz. *Tetracnemus*, *Di cladocerus*, *Elasmus*, and *Eulophus*; while “*minute rudiments of wings*” or “*wings almost rudimental*”

equally applies to Mr. Westwood's genus *Hemiptarsenus*, to which he has assigned this as a generic character of the male. To be sure, in the case of *Melittobia*, we have the "strikingly opposite analogy" in addition, but, unfortunately, this refers to "*Stylops*, *Meloë* and *Sitaris*," and even as regards them it is not explained in what this "strikingly opposite analogy" consists. Yet on these shallow pretensions Mr. Westwood questioned the accuracy of my statements, and now asserts that his insect and mine are identical, attempts to claim priority of description, and does not hesitate to declare in print, that "the facts (!) and characters" (?) he had given were "sufficient to identify the insect, and distinguish it from every known species of the family to which it belongs (!)." But not only does Mr. Westwood assert this sufficiency on his part, and the identity of the two insects, but discourteously affirms that my description of *Anthophorabia* is "perfectly unintelligible," and then, for some, no doubt, most cogent reasons best known to him, he heads his description published on the 12th of May as follows: "*Melittobia*, Westw. 1847; *Anthophorabia*, Newp. 1849." Now in this very description he has given the same number of characters for his insect, and has followed the exact order of notification of parts which I have followed in mine, published on the 24th of March; and while he modestly asserts that *six* out of the nine characters which I have given are erroneous, he has copied, in whole or in part, the very words I have employed, and the very order in which I have employed them in *five* out of these nine proscribed unintelligible characters! Is it probable that this could have been accidental on the part of one who is ever so especially alive to his own advantage? Will the reader believe that any one who has any regard for his own credit or for public opinion, could be capable of such an attempt at imposition on his patience and his judgement? Yet such are the facts, as a comparison of Mr. Westwood's description with mine in the 'Gardeners' Chronicle,' pages 295 and 183, will prove.

Whether the characters given for *Anthophorabia* are sufficient to identify the insect or not, I leave entirely to the decision of others. When these are compared with those now published of *Melittobia*, the asserted identity of the two insects appears to be extremely doubtful: thus the male *Anthophorabia* has ocelli instead of compound eyes; *Melittobia* is described as having neither compound eyes nor ocelli: *Anthophorabia* has the middle portion of the antenna "large and globose;" *Melittobia* has the corresponding portion of this organ "very small and subannulose."

But assuming for an instant, what Mr. Westwood is pleased to assert as a positive fact, that the two are identical, and *presuming* that his description corrects errors in detail in mine,

would this entitle him to claim priority of nomenclature while the chief characters I have given (the stemmatous eyes, and the great dilatation and excavation of the basilar and the enlargement of the middle joints of the antennæ in the male) remain for the identification of the insect? As well might I pretend that the discovery of external branchiæ, in the imago *Pteronarcys*, which had been overlooked, entitles me to sink Mr. Newman's name of that genus, and substitute one of my own.

The great object of nomenclature and structural description of external form, if I rightly apprehend, is *identification*. Now it happens that Mr. Westwood's name is attached in assent to a printed Report on Zoological Nomenclature adopted and published by a Committee of the British Association in 1842, and in which the following rules are announced:—"No person can subsequently claim an authority equal to that possessed by the person who is the first to *define* a new genus or *describe* a new species." "Unless a species or group is intelligibly defined when the name is given, it cannot be recognised by others, and the signification of the name is consequently lost. Two things are necessary before a zoological term can acquire any authority, viz. *definition* and *publication*. Definition properly implies a distinct exposition of essential characters, and in all cases we conceive this to be indispensable, &c." "To constitute *publication*, nothing short of the insertion of the above particulars in a printed book can be held sufficient." I have now but to ask whether Mr. Westwood has complied with the rules which he has thus assisted to establish, before attempting to supersede others; or whether he has not been one of the readiest to infringe them, as in the present instance, when they have not suited his convenience? It matters but little to me whether the name which I have given, or the one which he proposes for an insect, be ultimately adopted, as I can assure him that I have but little ambition to be regarded as a describer of species.

But I resist his encroachment on the principle of right, and I repudiate his unfounded assertions and assumptions as being equally derogatory to science and unfair to myself and others.

I am content to travel over what he may regard as humbler ground, to watch and experiment on function, and quietly endeavour to trace the connexion of this with anatomy, and to examine and compare internal as well as external organization, without aspiring to what the entomologist may look upon as an all-important consideration, the honour and dignity attached to the rare achievement of being the earliest to name and describe an insect,—an event equivalent in his mind, perhaps, to the discovery of a planet and the calculation of its orbit.

I remain, Gentlemen, yours very truly,

GEORGE NEWPORT.